

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-31. By this amendment, claims 1, 9, 17 and 24 have been amended.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the suggestions provided during the interview on August 22, 2007. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 24 have been amended. Claims 1-16 and 24-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Bartroli and further in view of Krishnan. Claims 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Bartroli. Applicants respectfully submit that Yoshida, Bartroli, and/or Krishnan alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1-31 and that claims 1-31 are now in condition for allowance.

For example, claim 1 recites in part, “distance mapping from a reference axis said display index values from the first set of data to a third set of data”. Yoshida, Bartroli, and/or Krishnan alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least this element of claim 1. Claim 9 recites in part, “a mapping unit for distance mapping from a reference axis said display index values from the first set of data to a third set of data”. Yoshida, Bartroli, and/or Krishnan alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least this element of claim 9. Claim 24 recites in part, “distance mapping from a reference axis said display index values from the first set of data to a third set of data”. Yoshida, Bartroli, and/or Krishnan alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least this element of claim 24. Accordingly, claims 1-16 and 24-31 are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn with respect to claims 1-16 and 24-31.

In addition, claim 17 recites in part, “selecting by a user various characteristics of the anatomical structure for enhancement”. Yoshida and/or Bartroli, alone or in combination do not teach or suggest at least this element of claim 17. Yoshida and/or Bartroli, alone or in combination do not teach or suggest that a user may select various characteristics of the structure for enhancement. The various characteristics may be shape, liquid, or fecal matter, among others. Subcategories of characteristics may be created and chosen for enhancement. For example, if the characteristic chosen is shape, subcategories of shapes may be cup, rut, saddle, ridge, and cap. Yoshida does not teach or suggest the ability of a user to select which characteristics of a structure should be enhanced on a display. Accordingly, claims 17-23 are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn with respect to claims 17-23.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Yoshida, Bartroli, and/or Krishnan alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1-31 and that claims 1-31 are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant has not made any admissions regarding the art cited by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the present application should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the application as amended is now believed to be in condition for allowance and an action to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below. Applicant believes no fee is due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account of GTC, Account No. 070845.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 22, 2007

/Brian C. Bianco/
Brian C. Bianco
Registration No. 51, 471

MCANDREWS, HELD, & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100